

REMARKS

Claims 14, and 22-24 have been amended.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 15-20, and 21 have been cancelled.

Claim 24 is in independent format.

Claims 14 and 22-24 remain pending.

1. Interview Summary

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the brief telephone interview on July 5, 2006 to discuss the Advisory Action and possible claim amendments. Specifically discussed was terminology suitable for overcoming the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of the claims due to the indefinite nature of the term "reduced". The Examiner indicated that the use of the term "diminished" would overcome this rejection in combination with reference to the defining descriptions of the invention found in the Specification at Para. [0022] which provide a tangible reference. Additionally discussed were the limitations of dependent Claim 24 as specifically set forth in the parent claim 20.

2. Species Election

The withdrawal of Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 15-19 from consideration is acknowledged. To ensure a complete reply to the final office action, these claims have now been cancelled.

3. Allowable Claims

The Examiner has indicate that Claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim 20 and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended Claim 24 into independent format by including all of the limitations of parent Claim 20, as originally worded. The claim has further been amended to overcome the Examiner's stated objection to the phrase "reduced smoke" as indefinite by deletion of the term "reduced" from the claim limitations and replacement with the term "diminished" as suggested by the Examiner. A detailed discussion of the relative level of smoke generated by the present invention may be found at Para. [0022] of the specification. Accordingly, Claim 24 is now believed in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 14, 22, and 23 have been amended to depend directly from independent Claim 24, and accordingly, are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as Claim 24.

4. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the remaining claims 14, and 22-24 are believed in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to pass the application to issue, and feels that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the purpose of arranging such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark E. Books

Mark E. Books, Reg. No. 40,918
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200
St. Louis, Missouri 63131
Tel: (314) 238-2400
Fax: (314) 238-2401
mbooks@patpro.com